



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,210	08/26/2003	Brian Scott Hallisey	200206455-1	1934
22879 7590 02/03/2010 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
EXAMINER AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS				
ART UNIT 2179		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/03/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
ipa.mail@hp.com  
laura.m.clark@hp.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/647,210

**Applicant(s)**

HALLISEY ET AL.

**Examiner**

NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE

**Art Unit**

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 10/12/2009. This action is made **Final**.
- B. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 remain pending.

---

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takaoka, Nobumitsu et al (US Pub. 2003/0085914 A1), herein referred to as "Takaoka" in view of Anslow, Roberta et al (US Pub. 2003/0130821 A1), herein referred to as "Anslow".

As for claim 1, Takaoka teaches a method of using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (figure 8 and par.61), the method comprising: illustrating at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies in the same mosaic-like graphic (figure 8; par.61, 67), each of said separate hierarchies representing one or more of the relationships amongst the resources (figure 8; and par.61-62, 76).

Takaoka teaches the layout of network resource component presented on the graphical user interface as being able to be customized into any configuration as sought by the end user (par.69); but Takaoka does not specifically mention exact layouts other than what is depicted in the figures of Takaoka, however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches arranging said resources representing a collection of the same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column (par.121 and fig.31) and wherein the mosaic-like graphic depicts a logical unit number (LUN) occupying a rank in both of the two overlapping but separate hierarchies (figure 24, items 852 (children), 854 (grandchildren), 866 (parent) loop 856-876 (rendering of objects to screen) par.106). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system by presenting to the user overlapping hierarchies to depict their relationships (par.7). Takaoka also is

concerned with presenting relationships of overlapping hierarchies. Takaoka teaches depicting this relationship in a specific formation. One of ordinary skilled in the art would recognize that this specific formation of presenting hierarchies could take other formations by manipulating the layout of on-screen objects. Anslow provides a variant alternative view (different formation) of relationships of resources of the data presented by Takaoka when combined. Modifying the layout of objects into a different formation as suggested by Anslow would be an obvious variation from the formation of Takaoka because both systems are related to depict similar information and presenting this information in either one formation would have been realized by one of ordinary skill in the art; to support this analysis look in par.264:Takaoka; further in par.69 where Takaoka suggest that the user themselves is capable of changing the display formation of objects presented in figure 8, thus one of ordinary skill in the art having knowledge of Anslow or the like would be able to create a similar formation within the system of Takaoka).

As for dependent claim 2, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said resources are represented by icons and further comprising:  
sizing said icons in proportion to said at least one attribute of said represented resource (par.16 and 69-70).

As for dependent claim 3, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said LUN is

a child in separate hierarchical trees (par.246). Anslow also teaches wherein said LUN is a child in separate hierarchical trees (par.121-123).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7).

As for dependent claim 5, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 2-4. Takaoka does not specifically mention exact layouts other than what is depicted in the figures, however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches labeling-said one of hierarchical columns and one hierarchical rows with an indication of at least one common feature (par.121 and fig.31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7)

As for dependent claim 6, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising: interacting with at least one said icon of said mosaic-like graphic, wherein said interaction results in a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resource; and in response to said interaction, restructuring a--said first mosaic-like pane by at least re-sizing said icons proportional to a change in said at least one attribute of

said represented resources, compared to a footprint of said at least one attribute prior to said interaction (par.74,246).

As for dependent claim 7, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 6, Takaoka does not specifically mention JBOD. Anslow teaches wherein said LUN reports to a volume group (VG) in one storage resources and just a bunch of disks (JBOD) in another storage resource. (par.34 and 121). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7).

As for dependent claim 8, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 7. Takaoka teaches displaying separate hierarchies of LUNs (figure 8, par.61-70). Takaoka does not specifically teach using a pop-up window or new window in detail; however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches simultaneously displaying in the mosaic-like graphics icons of LUNs in one column, icons of volume groups in a second column and icons of file volumes in a third column (par.34-35,121-123). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7).

As for dependent claim 9, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 7, Takaoka teaches displaying separate hierarchies of LUNs (figure 8, par.61-70). Takaoka does not specifically teach wherein arrays, LUNs, and volume groups are simultaneously displayed in separate columns, however Anslow does (par.121-123; figures 31-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7)

As for dependent claim 10, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the mosaic-like graphic is a first mosaic-like graphic the method further comprising illustrating a first mosaic-like pane and a second mosaic-like pane containing independent icons representative of resources that may be added to said at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies (figure 8; par.61-64), comprising: receiving an indication of a new relationship developed between a resource of a the type represented in said second mosaic-like pane and the resources represented in said first mosaic-like pane (figure 8; par.65-68); and restructuring, in response to receiving said indication, said at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies and corresponding said first mosaic-like pane by at least re-sizing said icons proportional to a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resources, compared to a footprint of said



at least one attribute prior to receiving said indication (par.69-70).

As for dependent claim 11, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 10, wherein said receiving an indication step, comprises: processing a drag-and-drop of at least one said independent icon from said second mosaic-like pane to said first mosaic-like pane (par.69).

As for dependent claim 12, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 11, further comprising: rejecting said processing of an invalid said drag-and-drop (par.41, 69-70).

As for dependent claim 13, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 11. Takaoka does not specifically teach using a pop-up window or new window in detail; however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches wherein said displaying attributes comprises: illustrating said attributes in a pop-up window (par.105). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7)

As for independent claim 14, Takaoka teaches a method of controlling the relationships amongst resources of a system, wherein said resources are iconically represented and illustrated on a Graphical User Interface (GUI) (figure 8; par.61-63), comprising: manipulating a relationship of resources in said iconically illustrated system; and re-

sizing areas of, in response to said manipulating, the relative footprints of said icons according to an effect upon respective ones of the resources, caused by the manipulating the relationship (figure 8; par.64-70). Takaoka teaches the layout of network resource component presented on the graphical user interface as being able to be customized into any configuration as sought by the end user (par.69); but Takaoka does not specifically mention exact layouts other than what is depicted in the figures, however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches wherein the relationship of the resources are shown in a hierarchical tree from placement of icons in columns with resources of a same type being in a same column (par.121 and fig.31), and a resource is shown as being a child to separate hierarchical trees that depict storage resources (figure 24, items 852 (children), 854 (grandchildren), 866 (parent) loop 856-876 (rendering of objects to screen) par.106). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system by presenting to the user overlapping hierarchies to depict their relationships (par.7). Takaoka also is concerned with presenting relationships of overlapping hierarchies. Takaoka teaches depicting this relationship in a specific formation. One of ordinary skilled in the art would recognize that this specific formation of presenting hierarchies could take other formations by manipulating the layout of on-screen objects. Anslow provides a variant alternative view (different formation) of relationships of resources of the data presented by Takaoka when combined. Modifying the layout of objects into a different formation as suggested

by Anslow would be an obvious variation from the formation of Takaoka because both systems are related to depict similar information and presenting this information in either one formation would have been realized by one of ordinary skill in the art; to support this analysis look in par.264:Takaoka; further in par.69 where Takaoka suggest that the user themselves is capable of changing the display formation of objects presented in figure 8, thus one of ordinary skill in the art having knowledge of Anslow or the like would be able to create a similar formation within the system of Takaoka).

As for dependent claim 15, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 14, wherein said manipulating step comprises: interacting with at least one icon, representative of one said resource in said iconically illustrated system to initiate a change of at least one attribute of said represented resource (par.69-70).

As for dependent claim 16, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 15, wherein said initiating step comprises: displaying, in response to said interaction step, attributes of said represented resource, wherein said attributes are changeable; and indicating changes to said at least one attribute through the operation of at least one peripheral device (par.50, 69-70, 74, 246).

As for dependent claim 17, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 16. Takaoka does not specifically teach using a pop-up window or new window in detail; however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches wherein said displaying attributes comprises:

illustrating said attributes in a pop-up window (par.105). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7)

As for independent claim 18, Takaoka teaches a method of displaying relationships amongst first, second and third types of resources of a system (figure 8), the method comprising: preparing a graphic of at least two separate but overlapping hierarchies such that viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type (figure 8; par.61-64), and viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type; and displaying the graphic (figure 8; par. 65-70). In anticipation of future amendment: Takaoka teaches the layout of network resource component presented on the graphical user interface as being able to be customized into any configuration as sought by the end user (par.69); but Takaoka does not specifically mention exact layouts other than what is depicted in the figures, however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches arranging said resources representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column (par.121

and fig.31), *"viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type, viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type(par.121-123; figures 31-32)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system by presenting to the user overlapping hierarchies to depict their relationships (par.7). Takaoka also is concerned with presenting relationships of overlapping hierarchies. Takaoka teaches depicting this relationship in a specific formation. One of ordinary skilled in the art would recognize that this specific formation of presenting hierarchies could take other formations by manipulating the layout of on-screen objects. Anslow provides a variant alternative view (different formation) of relationships of resources of the data presented by Takaoka when combined. Modifying the layout of objects into a different formation as suggested by Anslow would be an obvious variation from the formation of Takaoka because both systems are related to depict similar information and presenting this information in either one formation would have been realized by one of ordinary skill in the art; to support this analysis look in par.264:Takaoka; further in par.69 where Takaoka suggest that the user themselves is capable of changing the display formation of objects presented in figure 8, thus one of ordinary skill in the art having knowledge of

Anslow or the like would be able to create a similar formation within the system of Takaoka).

As for dependent claim 19, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the graphic is mosaic-like (figure 8).

As for dependent claim 20, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 19, wherein each of the first, second and third resources is represented as an iconic element of the mosaic-like graphic that includes logical unit numbers (LUNs), arrays and volume groups (figure 8). Anslow also teaches the inclusion of multiple types of storage (par.34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7).

As for dependent claim 21, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies represents physical storage resources of a storage system, and the second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies represents logical storage resources of the storage system (figure 8; par.61-65).

As for dependent claim 22, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the second direction is opposite to the first direction (figure 8). Takaoka teaches the layout of network resource component presented on the graphical user interface as being able to be customized into any configuration as sought by the end user (par.69); but Takaoka does not specifically mention exact layouts other than what is depicted in the figures, however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches arranging said resources representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column (par.121 and fig.31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7).

As for dependent claim 23, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 18, wherein said first, second and third types of resources are represented by icons, further comprising: sizing said icons in proportion to at least one attribute of said represented resource (par.68-70).

As for dependent claim 24, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 23, wherein said at least one attribute is storage capacity (par.68-70).

As for dependent claim 25, Takaoka teaches the method of claim 23, further comprising: Takaoka teaches the layout of network resource component presented on the graphical user interface as being able to be customized into any configuration as sought by the end user (par.69); but Takaoka does not specifically mention exact layouts other than what is depicted in the figures, however in the same field of endeavor Anslow teaches arranging said icons representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicate relationships between particular resources of the respective column (par.121 and fig.31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anslow into Takaoka; this is true because Anslow provides a solution to using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system (par.7).

---

**(Note :)** It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest reasonable interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited



reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues that Takaoka and Anslow does not teach "*that the mosaic-like graphic depicts a logical unit number (LUN) occupying a rank in both of the two overlapping but separate hierarchies*".

R1. Examiner agrees that Takaoka does not teach this limitation specifically. But Examiner does not agree with mention of Anslow. Applicants specification details that rank is related to parent and child identification within a hierarchy. Anslow teaches displaying separate hierarchies that have parent, child and grandchild nodes representing resources, specifically mentions LUN as well (figure 24, items 852 (children), 854 (grandchildren), 866 (parent) loop 856-876 (rendering of objects to screen) par.106).

A2. Applicant argues that Takaoka and Anslow does not teach "*a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column*".

R2. Examiner does not agree, Anslow directly provides evidence in paragraph 121 that teaches *a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column*. Wherein the user is able to see the relationship between host, cell, storage, switch, etc... by viewing the objects and how the layout of rows and columns interest a cell. Paragraphs 122-123 shows a different

rendering method which also shows separate hierarchies presented on a mosaic like graphic.

A3. Applicant argues that Takaoka and Anslow does not teach *"that a resource is shown as being a child to separate hierarchical trees that depict storage resources"*.

R3. Examiner does not agree, note R1 above.

A4. Applicant argues that Takaoka and Anslow does not teach *"viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type, viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type"*.

R4. Examiner does not agree, as stated prior Anslow teaches the display of separate hierarchies in different directions (as detailed in specification) with the intersection of column and rows of objects; Anslow teaches *"viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type, viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first*

*resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type (par.121-123; figures 31-32).*

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Inquires***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2179  
January 23, 2010

/Ba Huynh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179